



**SCOTTSDALE AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION  
SCOTTSDALE PLANNING COMMISSION  
JOINT WORK STUDY SESSION  
Scottsdale Airport Terminal Lobby  
15000 N. Airport Drive, Scottsdale, AZ**

**February 29, 2012**

**MINUTES**

**Airport Advisory Commission:**

**PRESENT:** Michael Goode, Chair  
William Bergdoll, Vice-Chair  
Gunnar Buzzard  
Bob Hobbi  
William Schuckert  
Steve Ziomek

**ABSENT:** Ken Casey

**STAFF:** Joe Padilla, City Attorney's Office  
Gary P. Mascaro, Aviation Director  
Kate O'Malley, Planning & Outreach Coordinator

**Planning Commission:**

**PRESENT:** Michael D'Andrea, Chair  
Ed Grant, Vice-Chair  
Matthew Cody  
Michael Edwards  
Jay Petkunas

**ABSENT:** David Brantner  
Erik Filsinger

**STAFF:** Tim Curtis, Current Planning Director

**OTHERS:** John Berry, Esq.

## **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Goode called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

## **ROLL CALL**

A formal roll call confirmed the presence of Commissioners as noted above.

Chairman Goode welcomed everyone to the joint work study session, inviting members of the public to fill out comment cards if they wished to address the meeting. He noted that the Planning Commission had voted to request this session. The Airport Advisory Commission agreed that this is a good opportunity to get together and discuss their ideas and approaches.

Chairman D'Andrea thanked the Airport Advisory Commission for inviting them. The Planning Commission wants to work with the Airport Advisory Commission to understand their perspective. Both Commissions are tasked with protecting the City's interests.

1. Overview and possible discussion of the Scottsdale Airport and Scottsdale Airport Advisory Commission including the Commission's roles, responsibilities, and legal requirements

Aviation Director Mr. Gary Mascaro welcomed everyone to the Airport. He screened the Scottsdale Airport Up Close video which won an award for Channel 11. This is available on the website at <http://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/airport>.

Mr. Mascaro explained that the Airport Advisory Commission is governed by Chapter 5 of the Scottsdale Revised Code. The Airport rules and regulations and the minimum operating standards govern the operation of the Airport and Airpark. The Airport is subject to environmental assessments and FEMA actions.

He noted that the Commission is responsible for aviation related and non aviation related development and land use policies at and surrounding Scottsdale Airport that would conflict with the Airport's 14 CFR Part 150.

The Commission's purview includes recommending Airport and Airpark rates and fees to City Council. The Airport charges user fees and is self-sufficient through the Aviation Enterprise Fund. The Airport receives no monies from the City's General Fund.

The Commission gives guidance to staff on working within the Statewide air transportation system, makes safety recommendations and deals with other Airport matters as needed, as defined by Chapter 5.

2. Overview and possible discussion of the Scottsdale Planning Commission including the Commission's roles, responsibilities, and legal requirements

Director of Current Planning Mr. Tim Curtis introduced Planning staff. He stated that the Planning Commission acts as advisory board to City Council on land use and zoning

matters. The Planning Commission is authorized to confer with other advisory commissions. It makes recommendations to City Council on all matters relating to General Plan amendments, zoning district map amendments, zoning ordinance text amendments, conditional use permits, municipal use master plans, abandonment of street and alley right of way, and other matters as needed.

Mr. Curtis elaborated that the Planning Commission may initiate zoning ordinance text amendments and municipal use master plans. Members of the Planning Commission also serve on the Development Review Board on a rotational basis. He summarized that the Commission deals with City-wide issues, neighborhoods, and individual site development matters.

Most matters that come before the Commission are subject to strict hearing and notice requirements, including early neighborhood outreach. He outlined the various media used to obtain community input because many of the Commission's decisions deal with compatibility issues. This is important not just because it is a legal requirement but because the City is committed to understanding the issues and mitigating any impacts. Sometimes surrounding communities are notified of proposals. As needed, the Planning Commission asks other Commissions for comments.

The Planning Commission meets twice monthly to keep abreast of its heavy workload. It takes a comprehensive view of land use policies, relationships, compatibilities, and impacts across the City, and at the neighborhood level. It is important to note that the Planning Commission evaluates proposals and stipulates to details.

3. Discussion and input regarding the land use application and approval process in the Airport vicinity and Airport influence area, which will include a discussion on the relationship between. and the respective roles and responsibilities of, the Planning Commission and the Airport Advisory Commission in the land use applications and approval process in this area

Referring to Chapter 5.109(c), which states that "The Airport Advisory Commission shall, with the assistance of City staff, advise the City Council as necessary" on items 4 and 7, Mr. Mascaro noted that item 4 talks about aviation related development that may be in conflict with the Part 150 study, as well as land use policies at and surrounding the Airport in conflict with Part 150 study. Scottsdale was the first general aviation airport in the country to have a Part 150 study. The first one was adopted by City Council in 1985 and updated in 1997 and 2005. Because this is in the City Code, it is a legal requirement for the Airport Advisory Commission to be involved in certain planning items.

The CFR Part 150 study has land use measures, each of which has been approved by the FAA. Land use item 1 is "With respect to the General Plans of the cities of Scottsdale and Phoenix, maintain the compatibility of planned areas within the 55 DNL contour." This contour is a baseline the City has used since 1985. Federal law prohibits noise sensitive development inside of the 65 DNL contour. The 55 DNL contour is a policy measure adopted by City Council.

Chairman D'Andrea asked if this means the City's policy is more stringent than the Federal requirements. Mr. Mascaro confirmed that is the case. Sky Harbor uses the 60 DNL contour. He stressed that these are policy decisions. However if they were to permit noise sensitive development inside the 65 DNL contour, there could be a challenge by the FAA.

Item 2 states that "The cities of Scottsdale and Phoenix should maintain a compatibility zoned area within the proximal study." The FAA strongly discourages rezoning for residential or other noise sensitive land uses within the airport influence area.

Item 4 states that "The cities of Scottsdale and Phoenix should enact project review guidelines for those areas impacted by Airport operations." This is the Airport influence area. Actions include fair disclosure notices, avigation easements and sound attenuation.

Mr. Mascaro gave a generic example. If a residential development is already allowed or entitled within the Airport influence area, the applicant completes an Airport vicinity development checklist. He described the short and long application forms. The long form is required if the development is adjacent to a taxi lane. Staff evaluate the height of the proposed development, the avigation easement if necessary, and sound attenuation if the development would be very close to the Airport. The applicant would proceed through the Planning Commission and City Council. Each month staff advises the Airport Advisory Commission of projects within the Airport influence area which are noise sensitive already entitled. The ordinance comes into play, requiring the Airport Advisory Commission to make a recommendation to City Council, because this is defined as a conflict to the Part 150 noise study.

Vice Chair Grant said to him it is interesting that a planning item triggers the review by the Airport Advisory Commission. Zoning is purely a planning item which has nothing to do with Airport operations. He asked why this is the trigger.

Mr. Mascaro said he would explain the land use regulation to clarify. The Airport influence area is a defined zone in the Part 150 study. That is defined by aircraft flying in and out of the Airport. The flight patterns are the origin of the Airport influence area, which is approved by the FAA. This document could change over time. He displayed a map showing the traffic pattern area, the 55 DNL contour, and the 65 DNL contour. This map is used to trigger the policies as directed by the FAA. The FAA advises airports to protect themselves from residential noise sensitive encroachment. Potentially this type of development could cause political challenges and even the closure of an airport. The FAA invests significant funds in public use airports and is watching to protect that investment.

He pointed out that item 2 states that efforts should be made to retain current commercial and industrial zoning designations within the study area. Additionally both cities should strongly discourage rezoning for residential or other noise sensitive land uses not

consistent with the respective General Plans. This would ensure compatible development within the Airport area. The FAA defines compatible development as non noise sensitive development.

Commissioner Hobbi interjected that some airports have been closed because of encroachment. Mr. Mascaro said he could not think of any actual closures but certainly some airports have been pressured. Santa Monica is a prime example of residential encroachment. Airport closure would be a policy decision by a local council. Certainly some private airports have been closed down.

Vice Chair Grant said he struggles with the size of the Airport influence area and noted there is already significant residential development within it. If it is strongly discouraged, why is there so much? He asked whether they are "playing a game of chicken." At what point does the FAA's strong discouragement become enough to be concerning to the Planning Commission? He personally thinks that the Airport is a tremendous asset for the City and should be protected.

Mr. Mascaro said from the perspective of the Airport and the FAA, in a perfect world there would be no residential development within the Airport influence area. In reality, every airport faces the same challenge. He stressed that really it is a policy decision ultimately made by City Council. He recalled ten years ago when he was Assistant Aviation Director, they were receiving significant noise complaints and pressure from the community. In fact they were receiving more complaints than Sky Harbor.

Chairman Goode said much of the residential development was already approved. Now the challenge is to protect the Airport.

Chairman D'Andrea said the Airport influence area is large and asked if a request for a zoning change will trigger the consideration by the Airport Advisory Commission. Mr. Mascaro confirmed that if the change is to a noise sensitive development within the Airport influence area, based on the policy document and City Code, City Council has requested that the Airport Advisory Commission give their recommendation. He explained that the Commission then has several choices. They may give the go ahead, they may not recommend that the rezoning be allowed, or they may add stipulations such as an aviation easement.

Mr. Mascaro pointed out that the Airport Advisory Commission may also advise the Planning Commission of such conflicts. In the past there were times when the Commission, working with Planning staff, made recommendations to the Planning Commission. City Council would then consider both recommendations. This is the typical preferred process, although it was not followed in the recent applications.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chairman Goode invited Mr. John Berry to address the meeting. Although he had completed a comment card, Mr. Berry said he had no comments at this point.

## **DISCUSSION**

Chairman Goode invited the members of the Airport Advisory Commission to introduce themselves briefly.

Commissioner Hobbi said this issue was what motivated him to join the Commission. This is an issue of national importance.

Commissioner Schuckert has been involved with the Airport since 1985 and brings the perspective of his professional real estate experience.

Commissioner Buzzard owns a business in the Airpark and serves with the National Guard.

Chairman Goode is Vice President of Sales for Net Jets. He is a retired Air Force colonel and has served as President of the Arizona Business Aviation Association.

Commissioner Bergdoll lives and works in the flight path and has a pilot's license. He joined the Commission because he saw what a tremendous asset the Airport is to Scottsdale.

Commissioner Ziomek is a partner in a corporate relocation company and owns a small real estate firm, both located within the Airpark. His home is about one mile south east of the runway, which is within the helicopter flight path. He has been a rescue pilot with the Coast Guard and currently flies out of the Airport for the Civil Air Patrol.

Chairman D'Andrea invited the members of the Planning Commission to introduce themselves.

Commissioner Edwards is an architect who has worked on a number of developments in the area of the Airport. He served on the Development Review Board for five years before being appointed to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Petkunas is Chief Operating Officer of a real estate private equity firm. The company has owned about 10,000 multifamily units and actively developed Scottsdale Quarter. He has participated in the Downtown Scottsdale Task Force, the South Scottsdale Economic Development Task Force, and the Public Art Steering Committee.

Chairman D'Andrea served on the Development Review Board in 2002 and was appointed to the Planning Commission four years ago. He is an architect and real estate developer and has done many projects Valley-wide. Responsible development is important to him.

Vice Chair Grant grew up in Scottsdale. He is fascinated by aviation and lives in the flight path. He works in economic development for SRP.

Commissioner Cody works for Cachet Homes.

Chairman Goode opened the meeting up for the joint discussion.

Referring to the light blue area of the map, Commissioner Cody asked whether any change in land use there that would intensify noise sensitive uses would be automatically denied by the Airport Advisory Commission.

Chairman Goode said in his personal opinion, each case must be looked at on its own merits.

Commissioner Hobbi said growth and economic development are important for Scottsdale. This is good neutral ground for both Commissions. There is no blanket policy saying that the Airport Advisory Commission would not recommend developments. However the Commission is very interested in what is being built close to the Airport. Noise sensitive development cause challenges for the Airport, which is a viable economic entity for the City. He summarized that the two bodies have mutual interests. The Airport Advisory Commission is just trying to ensure that everyone's interests are protected. He has served on national organizations and encroachment is a huge issue for aviation across the U.S.

Chairman D'Andrea asked whether the Airport Advisory Commission is essentially acting like a land use body for the 37 square miles of the Airport influence area.

Commissioner Hobbi replied that they are protecting the interests of the Airport. If that includes land use issues, then so be it.

Commissioner Ziomek said by statute the Commission is required to make recommendations to City Council regarding the Airport influence area. He agreed that projects in the light blue area are each considered on their merits. Some areas would be suited to noise sensitive land uses. However, if there were a proposal to build condominiums on the WestWorld site, for example, he would probably vote against that.

Commissioner Cody summarized that the Airport Advisory Commission would exercise their discretion on proposed development in the AC-1 area. Chairman Goode agreed, saying that this is what City Council has mandated.

Vice Chair Grant noted that in the Scottsdale Airport Up Close video, the Mayor, Councilman Littlefield and Commissioner Buzzard all said the location of the Airport is one of its assets. He is struggling to understand the proximity issue. He asked how this pertains to airport operations. He believes in protecting the Airport and suggested the two bodies need to think about how to give better input to each other.

Chairman Goode said the three recent residential cases were pushed through. The Airport Advisory Commission was unable to reschedule its meeting to consider the applications before they went to the Planning Commission. This is a departure from the normal process.

Mr. Mascaro confirmed that he and Mr. Curtis work closely together and try to balance the timing so the Airport Advisory Commission will be able to make its recommendations ahead of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Buzzard recalled how well the process worked in July 2010 when the Greater Airpark Character Study was under consideration.

Chairman Goode asked Vice Chair Grant where he believes the limit should be for construction around the Airport. His opinion as a lay person with respect to aviation is that he enjoys watching jets. He has never lived in ultra close proximity to an airport. When he voted for the three cases he was looking at the Part 150 study. His understanding of that was that as long as projects within the AC-1 and AC-2 areas fulfilled the conditions set forth, it was okay. He asked the Airport Advisory Commission for their perspective on where the conflict was, acknowledging that one of the developments was partly inside the 55 DNL contour.

Mr. Padilla cautioned everyone not to discuss specific cases as this was not agendized.

Chairman D'Andrea said the question is, per the Part 150 study, residential uses are allowed in AC-1 and AC-2. The Planning Commission sees this as a pattern of not supporting cases that under this policy the Airport Advisory Commission should support. A policy is in place and the Airport Advisory Commission is voting against it, which he cannot understand.

Mr. Mascaro said this is a great question. The Part 150 says if the property is already entitled residential in AC-1 and AC-2, the matrix is triggered. If the parcel is not entitled, the Airport Advisory Commission has the ability to make its own recommendation.

Chair D'Andrea argued that planning and zoning is dynamic and that the Commission is taking a static snapshot of the way things are today and not allowing different uses.

Mr. Mascaro said the land use policy is that residential is strongly discouraged, and it is up to City Council to make the decision. If a project does not involve a zoning change, the case would not go before the Airport Advisory Commission.

Chair D'Andrea thanked him, stressing that he wanted to be sure his understanding was correct and that he was not trying to imply that the Airport Advisory Commission should not have an opinion. He wanted the Commission to understand how applicants perceive this process. Having conflicting recommendations from two Commissions is not desirable.

Commissioner Petkunas asked if there was a map showing both the noise contours and zoning. Mr. Curtis said there is not; such a map would be very difficult to read. Mr. Mascaro added that when this study was done, there were no noise sensitive developments within AC-3. In AC-2 during the time the study was completed, one area was identified for adjustment, which was the golf course, which at the time was zoned residential. Today nothing within AC-2 has a residential or noise sensitive component.

Commissioner Petkunas suggested that staff create a map showing which undeveloped areas within the Airport influence area are not zoned residential. This would enable everyone to identify where conflicts may arise. After discussion with staff, he undertook to think about this idea and get back to Mr. Curtis.

Commissioner Cody inquired whether a zoning change to higher density residential would also trigger the matrix and the involvement of the Airport Advisory Commission. Mr. Mascaro said it probably would.



Vice Chair Grant said when the Planning Commission is evaluating a case it has fairly tight definition on why the Commission can vote a certain way. He feels the Planning Commission would like to remove the subjectivity from the equation for the Airport Advisory Commission. He added that the Planning Commission has its own disagreements so everything is not objective. He is trying to come up with something definitive. The different approaches are part of the misunderstanding between the two bodies. He personally always tries to follow the guidelines on every case. He observed that there are conflicts between the Airport Character Area Plan and the Part 150 study and he does not understand which takes precedent.

Commissioner Hobbi said this is a very dynamic issue. The problems they see facing airport activity across the nation begin with residential issues and noise complaints. The Commission has to consider issues that impact the Airport. When citizen complaints reach the point of protest, everyone is a loser.

Commissioner Schuckert said the Airport received 939 noise complaints in 2011, some of which come from outside the Airport influence area. When they increased the weight limit, citizens organized to voice their disapproval.

Chair D'Andrea argued that an average of 78 complaints monthly seems reasonable given the number of homes in the area. He could not understand why the Airport Advisory Commission would not support multifamily housing.

Commissioner Ziomek said the Airport Advisory Commission has to protect the current and future use of the Airport. As a result of the new projects, the FAA will have to change helicopter reporting points. This is the subjective aspect they must consider. It is not only current noise but future noise.

Chairman Goode added that he is very familiar with Santa Monica. Now users cannot start their auxiliary power units before 7:00 a.m. Residents have had air sampling done to test for jet fuel in the atmosphere. He anticipates it will be closed after the city of Santa Monica takes over operations in 2014. He could not tell Chair D'Andrea how many noise complaints the Santa Monica airport receives, and undertook to find out.

Chair D'Andrea asked how 78 noise complaints per month threaten what the Airport Advisory Commission is trying to protect. Chairman Goode enumerated flight restrictions such as no stop and goes and changes to flight patterns which have already taken place at Scottsdale.

Commissioner Hobbi said Chairman D'Andrea's questions are great. He asked him whether reducing the weight limits at the Airport would be good for Scottsdale. Chair D'Andrea agreed that it would not. Commissioner Hobbi said it was the same people who have been making the noise complaints who urged City Council not to adopt the increase in the weight limits. This proves that 78 complaints a month is enough to cause difficulties to Airport operations.

Chairman D'Andrea said larger aircraft would be noisier.

Citing his AZBAA experience with this issue, Chairman Goode said the two aircraft in question are the Gulfstream 5 and the Bombardier Global 5000 and 6000. These craft have been landing in Scottsdale for ten years. The runway limit was 75,000 pounds. The Airport and the AZBAA wanted these aircraft to be able to take off fully fueled at 100,000 pounds. These Stage 4 planes are the quietest, the safest, and have generally the most experienced crews. Nonetheless there was picketing at the Airport and many citizens addressed the Commission in opposition to the proposal. As more people live much closer to the Airport, he is afraid of even greater difficulties in the future. Santa Monica and other airports are facing huge difficulties.

Chair D'Andrea said Scottsdale is a unique airport in terms of its context. He opined that residential is part of the vibrant community of the Airport. He feels that great economically viable projects are being rejected simply due to a fear of noise complaints.

Chairman Goode said it is impossible to quantify what an acceptable number of noise complaints would be. He pointed out that there is plenty of land in the AC-1 area that is already zoned residential, and the Airport Advisory Commission would not be considering projects in that category.

Commissioner Bergdoll said that decisions about growth in this area are really a policy decision. As residential projects are built closer to the Airport the possibility of restrictions on operations increases. He reminded the meeting that helicopter flight patterns are different than for the fixed wing craft. Helicopter noise along Hayden Road towards the Loop 101 is a big source of complaints.

Commissioner Hobbi added that the aerospace industry is fully aware of this challenge. Billions of dollars have spent on addressing aircraft noise. The Commission is not opposed to economic development. Aerospace has contributed to the economic growth of the region.

Chairman D'Andrea asked how he could say that when the Airport Advisory Commission voted against three very viable multi housing projects.

Commissioner Hobbi said those developments encroach on the Airport. If the Airport closes, it would not be good for anyone.

Chairman D'Andrea argued that according to the Commission's own policy, the projects should have been approved.

Commissioner Hobbi explained that the projects encroach on the Airport because two-thirds of one project is actually within the 55 DNL contour.

Mr. Padilla interjected that the meeting needs to stay away from specifics not on the agenda for discussion.

Commissioner Petkunas said this has been an enlightening discussion for him. The Airport Advisory Commission is charged with maximizing the efficiency and operating effectiveness of the Airport. He now understands that residential uses lead to noise complaints, which are not good for the Airport. The logical conundrum facing them is how can one use that is

already entitled be acceptable because it is an existing use but the same use cannot be permitted in the same neighborhood. When the Planning Commission was considering these applications his attitude was that people should not move close to an airport and then complain about the noise. He is starting to understand that they will complain anyway.

Chairman Goode said that adding so many rental units so close to the Airport will necessarily lead to more noise complaints.

Chairman D'Andrea asked if all the complaints are made by the same individuals. Chairman Goode explained that this is tracked in several ways. Chairman D'Andrea said people in rental developments know what they are getting into before they move in. Citing the success of the condominiums at Kierland, he said many people would love to live right by the Airport.

Displaying a map of noise complaints for the fall of 2011, Mr. Mascaro said they are scattered throughout the Airport influence area. Commissioner Hobbi told Chairman D'Andrea that the complaints originate from the AC-1 area because there is no residential closer to the Airport. Mr. Mascaro showed where the residential units are located in AC-2. One person complained 63 times in the last quarter of 2011.

Chairman Goode reviewed the annual noise complaint numbers for recent years. In 2005 a maximum of 15,000 complaints were received. Mr. Mascaro noted significant complaints starting in 2003. He explained that the Part 150 study was being done which made the public more aware of aircraft noise. During the Part 150 study, City Council asked the Aviation Department to look into an FAA Part 161 study. This does a cost benefit analysis to create restrictions on the Airport. At the time, City Council was leaning towards restrictions based on communications from voters. Based on the FAA regulations they found there would be no impact of noise sensitive development so there was no Federal funding available to do a Part 161 study or create restrictions. This occurred during that time frame.

Chair D'Andrea said at the peak of the complaints represented 1,250 each month and now the average is 78. This is a reduction of 94.8% from the peak.

Commissioner Cody said several of the Commissioners live near the Airport. He asked whether the Airport Advisory Commission has taken steps to see what effect the Airport has on residents in the AC-1 area.

Commissioner Buzzard noted that the Commission only makes recommendations, not policy. It is the Commission's inherent responsibility to consult the policies, directive and procedures they have. They have a responsibility to look at the noise compatibility plan. He pointed out that the language uses conditional words like "should" and "may," not directive words like "will" or "shall," so some flexibility is built into the process. That flexibility allows City Council to make the policy decisions. It is part of city government that different commissions will have different opinions. It is incumbent upon the Commission to have a logical, thoughtful, cogent reason for their recommendations. The policies themselves are well written. The Airport Advisory Commission has to go beyond the AC-1, AC-2 and AC-3 issues and look at land use elements.

Mr. Mascaro added that the Airport has added 16 different noise abatement measures to work with the surrounding community.

Commissioner Cody, who lives in the AC-1 area, said he considers the Airport is a very good neighbor.

Chairman Goode said the noisiest aircraft, Stage 2, will be banned from all U.S. airports starting in 2014. At Scottsdale adjusting the helicopter flight routes has helped to reduce some of the noise complaints. They are doing everything they can to mitigate noise complaints. He wants to protect the Airport over the long term. He assured the Planning Commission that the Airport Advisory Commission wants development. Each application is considered on its own merits. The recommendation on the three recent applications was not, in fact, unanimous.

Chairman D'Andrea said his concern is that when the two Commissions' recommendations conflict, the applicants suffer.

Vice Chair Grant said it is clear that the Airport Advisory Commission can make recommendations to the Planning Commission. He had intended to come to the Airport Advisory Commission meeting at which the three applications were considered but was unavoidably prevented. He pointed out that both Commissions meet in the same time slot. He suggested to the extent that the Airport Advisory Commission members have strong feelings about cases that the Planning Commission should know about, that they let them know. He appreciates their added perspective. He believes that both Commissions want better communication going forward.

Chairman D'Andrea said he and Chairman Goode had a good telephone conversation and in the past he has spoken with former Chairman Buzzard. He believes that the Planning Commissioners may have insights on various projects they could share with the Airport Advisory Commission.

Citing open meeting laws, Mr. Padilla said in theory it could be problematic for the Chairmen to phone each other. They could consult with the staff attorney beforehand.

Commissioner Edwards said the increase in the weight limits would increase traffic into the Airport even if the aircraft are not noisier. He felt the increase in the weight limit would open more challenges to the survival of the Airport than a zoning application.

Chairman Goode reviewed the issues surrounding the increase in the weight limit. Currently aircraft over 75,000 pounds have to give prior notice before arriving. Only four aircraft have used the Airport since the weight limit was increased some 18 months ago. He reiterated that the Commission has had to educate the community about these facts. They even had a G5 on the tarmac for the Commission meeting to show the public what the planes are like. He reiterated that for the Airport Advisory Commission the bottom line is to avoid restrictions on the Airport.

Chairman D'Andrea commented that this decision was based on the need for economic development, just as the Planning Commission's decisions are, and both generate complaints.

Chairman Goode said the planes in question had been flying into Scottsdale for ten years so that is not necessarily the case. However now they have international customs so travelers can arrive direct from China or Europe. The aircraft can take off fully fueled and return home on a direct flight.

Citing his experience living near O'Hare Airport in Chicago, Chairman D'Andrea asked whether the frequency of flights generates complaints. Chairman Goode said this would not be a factor in Scottsdale. Mr. Mascaro cited the departure of three flight schools and the change in the fleet mix over the last five years. The larger corporate aircraft generate less noise complaints than the small single piston planes. However if noise is defined as unwanted sound it is a personal perception of each person. In reply to a further comment by Chairman D'Andrea he stated that citizens complain about emissions and safety as well as noise. Chairman D'Andrea commented that he has a new appreciation for the work of the Airport staff and the Airport Advisory Commission.

Commissioner Hobbi said that balancing the Commission's liability to the community and attracting economic development is a huge challenge. Economic development is good for everyone. On the other hand it is tough to educate the general public. Having people living really close to the Airport is something they cannot control. He added that even when people sign papers agreeing not to complain, this is ineffective.

Commissioner Edwards commented the more successful the Airport becomes, the more potential there is for it to disappear. As the Airport gets busier, complaints will increase and at some time they will reach a tipping point.

Chairman Goode summarized that they can live with the situation as it exists but if they increase airport operations and allow increased residential density around the Airport this is a recipe for trouble. Everyone on the Commission dreads becoming another Santa Monica. Everyone is here because they love Scottsdale and want it to grow. The Airport is a vital part of that growth engine.

Chairman D'Andrea agreed, but added that the people are also part of the growth. People want to live in the Airport area. That is why it is important to balance the Airport's interests. He thanked the Airport Advisory Commission for hosting the meeting.

Commissioner Buzzard pointed out that airports cannot vote; the citizens do. Residential and airport uses are not fully compatible. Having spoken with FAA staff with long experience around the country he is very aware of this consideration. Collectively both bodies need to be mindful of the issues.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A/V Tronics, Inc. DBA AVTranz